JPRS-TAC-86-035

24 APRIL 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-035

24 APRIL 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

[illegible]
[illegible] April [illegible]

[illegible] AND [illegible] ARMS

[illegible] CDU, SPD OFFICIALS [illegible] ON [illegible] WITH U.S.

[illegible] Cologne ARD Television Network in German [illegible] GMT 2 Apr 86

[Interview with Volker Rühe, CDU/CSU deputy floorleader, and Andreas von Bülow, chairman of the SPD security-policy committee, by "In Brennpunkt" moderator Huschke Lanzke — live]

[Text][Lanzke] The fact that the agreement has remained secret so this day in conformance with the desire of the United States can hardly be said to misinterpretations. Mr Rühe, [illegible] claims that Germans have had to pay the price for the even more restrictive handling of technology transfer to the East in the future. What about this claim?

[Rühe] There is nothing to it. On the contrary, we concluded a general technological agreement in Washington which will improve the conditions of cooperation and which, above all, will create an institution which will settle disputes. In this connection I would like to stress that the term secret agreement is wrong. If it were a secret agreement we would be unable to talk about it today because we would not even know about its existence. And we definitely cannot say that people in the Federal Republic are not aware of it. The truth is that the text will remain confidential. This is a drawback, but since the British concluded an agreement of this nature with the Americans, it was impossible to reveal the text. But you will see that the Federal Government will inform Parliament in every detail; the opposition, too, already has been offered concrete information. Hence, I am positive that no gaps will remain in this respect, so that no one will be able to read anything into this agreement which is not contained therein.

We do have a better basis now for the cooperation between German companies and the the U.S. side, and we did not pay any political price for that.

[Lanzke] Mr von Bülow, you are an opposition deputy. Has this agreement lived up to what the government and the opposition had referred[illegible] linked with it in the way of preconditions?

[Von Bülow] Not at all. Basically the Germans enabled into the American trap like fools and practically did their bidding. I assume that if the secret agreement were published it would become plainly evident that they made fools of themselves. They had intended to conclude a general technology agreement to improve for the German companies the options and conditions for the transfer of patents and utilization rights, also outside NATO. This will not at all happen. We can see that the American tendency to basically restrict, namely, a tendency to more and more wrangle trade with the East

with respect to modern technologies. This began with CFIUS (Committee on Foreign Investment), and it continues. We are on here the situation where it is not German authorities alone that control compliance with CFIUS — meaning the conditions of the technology transfer — but that the U.S. administration is allowed to share sensitive rights on Germany soil.

[Host] Perhaps briefly a note concerning CFIUS which we have mentioned twice: It stands for a list of competition about investigations in Deal Flow which are subject to restrictions.

[Ms Sachs] A lot will be constantly enlarged because the Americans believe that they can be ahead. Since the Russians have a situation where they cannot make up for lost ground in technology development. This is very important in our industry.

[Host] Mr Sachs?

[Sachs] This has nothing to do with CFIUS or with trade with the East. This is perhaps more illustrated by the news reports tonight. The Mercedes-Widmann is negotiating in Russia. Trade with the East continues and will even be beneficial. Hence, this has nothing to do with the agreement. It is more intimation.

This agreement we have a better head than without agreement. I think this is obvious to all. We now have a prohibition to discriminate. Just imagine that German companies must be created in the name of American companies, and [illegible] German daily chores. German companies contributing its presence will be processed with their prior art. All this would not have been achieved without agreement. Hence, I can only say that anyone rejecting an agreement initially will create more conditions for competition. It goes without saying that there is a chance for more such agreements.

[Host] Mr Sachs, you have mentioned the drafted of the agreement, the secrecy. Is it not another drawback of the agreement that it was the secretaries Kissinger who signed it for the German side while it was the secretary of defense on the U.S. side? We did not hound to lead to misunderstandings — we have heard that in the preceding video reports — where the Americans say that this is political support for a military project?

[Sachs] I do not think that the dispute over the question whether this is a civilian or a military agreement does much good. After all, we granted political support for this research within the framework of the NATO Treaty a year ago, not because we want to control others and divide this agreement, but because every responsible Bundestag politician who cares protect the Western free-thing research, must be wise of this Swiss research dealer from leading the United States. This is the political background if it is all, and of course it is a security-policy background. After all, this does not involve a new strategic-trading process.

Based against this background of German security-policy interest, it was necessary to improve the chances of cooperation for the German companies and to create — as the second fact on which this agreement rests — an information link between the two governments so that we all be informed in detail about the programs of research and that will be able to properly assess strategy. My Question will have more influence on the decisions than we would have without an agreement, as the opposition suggests.

[Host] Mr Von Dulsen, your Bundestag faction demands and that the Bundestag approve the agreement. Why, what do you hope to gain?

[Tom Bastiat] Bitte beachten a political agreement ist an agreement that regulation political contracts, and political contracts must be approved by the very legislation to the PPE which is competent for that, and bitte in the Bundestag.

Let me say something else. Bitte which PPE program was the result of an election campaign gag for Bangers. Is material thought up by the Portugues. I have from the research director of the Portugues that the attitude of bitte program in the United States in "some Bull Shack" the americans and Europeans either. No. Bundes, Spain have being research all the time. What the update of it all will be is at least an industrial policy in favor of the United States. PPE parents constituent to German companies will be protected, of course, no this: are protected area here, and which company can see to that in this contract. The alternative bitte parents to be of interest to the Americans, bitte company will be subject to the USSR tax; Spain, the Americans will have access. So far as the new Portugal are concerned, I assume that the Americans, the Portugues, will actually action here the German contracts objective Tax [illegible] with T.I. Credit, the parents will of course be T.I. property. But as far as the equal status of German and T.I. companies is concerned, I can only warn of service brutality and egotism on the part of the Americans...

[Bundes, interrupting] Without a contract then...

[Tom Bastiat, interrupting] Let a moment, bitte in time I will work. A German company negotiates its shares and property in its parents. Then become subject to the right of the Portugues. Then the Americans have the option of distributing returns. Bitte means that the German company will not even enjoy the benefit of a large market within the framework of the PPE program.

[Lunch] We will be discussing economic aspects shortly. I would like to mention another topic: arms control. Does bitte agreement impede the potential arms control positions of the Western allies and the PPE as well? Mr Bundes?

[Bundes] It does not. All we do is to attend negotiations in the framework in the context as it proceeds within the framework of the GPP treaty. Bitte is in the common equity mechanism. There are treaties under which research work has been exchanged. In fact PPE has had a promoting effect on the arms control negotiations, and it is necessary to do something to keep it that way. It means that if bitte would proceed to disinvestment or halt — which is a completely open question — it would be necessary to negotiate on that. But as far, it has had a rather positive effect on the Start/Mbfr arms control negotiations.

[Tom Bastiat] So far as I am concerned bitte is another breakthrough of the T.I. multinational companies. All big companies are committed to bitte initiative by the PPE program that involves billions.

Hence, we have assumed that arms control will not see any progress in the decisive world in the next two years. We will always have with small, narrow fields on which we can come to terms with the Russians. But that will not be tackled in the really serious attempt at balancing interests with the Soviet Union which is now general secretary.

[Lunch] The German industry vision mentions optimism but that is not justified. Mr Bundes, can the agreement necessary at all? Regrettably the French Spam alliance involved PPE politically, but the industrial companies happily cooperate with the Americans. Why bitte German agreement?

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Thank you, gentlemen.

[illegible]
[illegible]

[redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] interview with Vasilenko Sokolnikov, Senior Director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, conducted by T. Nagorny, under the rubric "The Scientist's Notebook". "For the Sake of Peace on Earth".

[Text] [Question] Vasilenko Nikolaievich, the main issue, the core, so to speak, of the meeting in Geneva between CPSU CC General Secretary M. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan was the question of war and peace, the neutralization of disarmament and prevention of the militarization of space. We know that broad groups of the scientific community are speaking out against the Star Wars program which the current U.S. administration is offering and which is called the Strategic Defense Initiative. And this is true not just of Soviet scientists, but also of Western scientists, including those in the FRG. The main reasons are the difficulties regarding this program?

[Answer] Soviet scientists have repeatedly maintained that there have been around 10,000 years in the history of mankind. We have not only survived them, but in continuing to enjoy the fruits of social, economic, scientific and technical progress. There have even been years in the past which have led to the invention of various weapons, namely gunpowder, the introduction of atoms, and so forth. There were years of pacification. Some today use the word "detente" to describe this, for example—the raising of mass feeling crises, the reduction of irrigation systems, Puerto Rico there were flowering summer—the situation of discovering mass shell that was thousands of years ago.

Part of the just cause to compare with the efforts of a nuclear catastrophe, however. Nuclear weapons have passed force that was type of weapon ever invented to date. And should a nuclear war break out, this would be a qualitatively new phenomenon unprecedented in the history of human civilization, which would threaten the existence.

We have now reached a definite point at which the arms race could spread even to outer space, a time when it is planned to create laboratory new types of weapons—not nuclear weapons but ones which are equally powerful. Mankind is at the point beyond which the scale of military crisis becomes irreversible. This is why there is nothing more important today, before it is too late, than halting the arms, beginning to reduce it, lessening the international situation

[illegible]. But then the other side would have to create [illegible] the automatic [illegible] countermeasures. That is, the fate of mankind would be placed [illegible] into the hands of automatic devices. And automatic devices can make mistakes. We know [illegible] our own personal experience [illegible] after all, there have been cases in which warning systems have reacted [illegible], mistaking flocks of wild geese for [illegible] as an example. There [illegible] time to [illegible] in each [illegible]. There would be [illegible] no time for this. And in case of a [illegible], the automatic devices would start a war without asking anyone.

I want to stress the fact that this is the opinion not just of Soviet scientists, but of the majority of American scientists as well. Professor [illegible] has reached an absolutely unequivocal conclusion as a result of a thorough scientific analysis. One of the most prestigious organizations of [illegible] scientists and a number of eminent physicists [illegible] believe that "an attempt to implement the [illegible] involved in SDI would with [illegible] have precisely the opposite effect and would result in the destabilization of an already critical situation, thereby having our security and [illegible] [illegible] chances of survival."

[Question]: We also have to refer to [illegible] and [illegible] which threatens to destroy all the achievements of human civilization and life on Earth itself. How [illegible] in this process?

[Answer]: The development of large-scale cooperation embracing broad spheres in various areas of economic, social and cultural life has always been considered to be one way to overcome a [illegible] of mutual distrust in relations among states. The achievement of agreements on expanding the program of bilateral cultural, educational, scientific and technical exchanges, as well as on the development of trade and economic ties, was one result of the meeting between CPSU CC General Secretary M. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan.

The study and the use of outer space for peaceful purposes is also a field of endeavor which is most suitable for international cooperation. Space affairs are essentially international, after all, and basic problems of space investigation are of importance to all mankind. Cosmonautics contributes to the accelerated development of many areas of the economy. International space communications and satellite meteorology have become widespread. Space vehicles are used in support of maritime shipping and navigation, including activities conducted within the framework of various international organizations.

The [illegible] of [illegible] to [illegible] in the COSPAS-SARSAT satellite system, an acronym for "Search and Rescue by Satellite Tracking," which recently began operating. It included Soviet and American space vehicles. The successful and effective use of a space system for searching for vessels and aircraft in distress and for rescuing victims of accidents is a graphic example of the fruitfulness of international cooperation.

[Question]: The Soviet Union and the [illegible] have greater economic, scientific and technical capabilities for cooperation in space than do other nations. Why are the prospects?

[Answer] Even now, at a time when there are no official agreements between the USSR and the USA on cooperation in space research, the spirit of scientific curiosity has proved so great that Soviet and American scientists have reached agreement on certain joint activities for studying the atmosphere of Venus and the nature of Halley's Comet under the Venus-Halley project. Two Soviet Vega automatic stations are even now approaching Halley's Comet and will make direct studies of its features for the first time in the history of science.

The development of Soviet-American cooperation in space exploration will depend first of all upon the regulation of political relations between the USSR and the USA and improvement of the international situation, upon how realistically the American side approaches the cardinal problems of the contemporary era.

Nor should we forget that the development of space research is restrained to a large extent by the amount of financing. It would not be superfluous to note that the USA has spent 40 billion dollars on all of its research in the field of missile technology between 1964 and 1985. If current "research" under the SDI program is continued for another 10 years, it will cost 225 billion dollars. The total cost of the program is truly astronomical--one trillion dollars. It would be difficult right off to imagine what the list of space projects would be if the enormous funds it is planned to spend on Star Wars were even partially transferred to peaceful space research.

Reaching agreement to keep space peaceful is the most important problem of our time. People will ultimately assess the results of the Geneva summit meeting from how things stand with respect to preventing the militarization of space. The dialog has been started, and it now needs to be continued, gradually overcoming the difficulties which have accumulated. The United States must give up the Star Wars plans, which are frought with the most dangerous consequences.

11499
CSO: 5200/1282

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: SHULTZ CALLS FOR 'QUIET DIPLOMACY' ON ARMS CONTROL

LD010309 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 31 Mar 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Secretary of State Shultz, who, as I mentioned in the first broadcast, made a trip to Italy and certain other countries of Western Europe, has just declared that to continue, or as he put it, to overcome, sorry, as he put it, the deadlock in Soviet-U.S. talks on arms control, it is necessary, allegedly, to activate so-called quiet diplomacy. It is a question, in Shultz' words, of conducting a discussion of the problems through unofficial channels. But how can one reconcile these calls for quiet diplomacy with the fact that the head of the foreign policy department of the United States has, at the same time, confirmed the negative position of Washington regarding the Soviet proposal on holding a summit in the near future in Europe to conclude an agreement on banning nuclear tests? THE WASHINGTON POST, citing well-informed circles, writes that the United States is planning 16 nuclear explosions this year. And in Washington, it is not concealed that the United States is now carrying out the biggest program of the past 20 years in building nuclear arms, for use as warheads for missiles and in the form of the so-called pump for space-based laser weapons. In its plans for "star wars," the U.S. military is striving to use the latest scientific achievements not only in the United States itself but also in other countries, in particular the FRG, Britain, Italy, and Japan.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVE EXAMINED

PM031324 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 86 p 1

[Article by Chief Marshal of Artillery V. Tolubko: "Command of the Times"]

[Text] More than 2 months ago, on 15 January 1986, our country put forward a program of universal security through disarmament. The 27th CPSU Congress defined the struggle to implement that program as the central direction of the USSR foreign policy. The heart of the Soviet program, as the message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar states, is the plan for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons with a ban on space strike arms. All the world's peoples greeted the Soviet proposals with optimism.

As was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress, in the American message "positive statements are submerged in various kinds of provisos, 'linkages,' and 'conditions' which in fact block the resolution of fundamental questions of disarmament."

It is known that individual responsible representatives of the U.S. Administration make various references in the mass media to allegedly vague aspects of individual sections of the Soviet statement. It has even been candidly stated that the United States cannot stop developing SDI.

It is becoming obvious that the USSR's humane course is countered by a fundamentally different U.S. course based on a desire to turn space into a military bridgehead from which it would be possible to achieve supremacy and dictate American will to all mankind by using space strike weapons. The Pentagon's allegation that the USSR long ago developed [razrabotat] space weapons and has them in orbit is far from the truth. At the present time neither the USSR nor the United States has weapons in space. A dangerous stage for mankind could come about if strike means are put into space to hit targets in space or on the earth from space, or if means are established on earth to hit space targets. It is this that would signify the start of a space arms race.

The Soviet leadership adopted a decision to extend by 3 months the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and, after the expiry of that time, until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. By that humane act our party and government gave the American side extra time to realistically assess the situation which had taken shape in the world. But the United States, ignoring the will of the peoples, threw down an insolent challenge to mankind and conducted a nuclear explosion in Nevada.

Reports are coming from the United States, from Washington, that the U.S. Administration is allocating more and more funds to arms. In 1986, spending on the SDI program is increasing 80 percent, and the programs to create MX and Midgetman missiles, Trident submarines, and B-1 bombers are in full swing. [People on the other side of the ocean are now speaking increasingly frequently is to be guided in its foreign policy.] What kind of concept is this? It is none other than the granting of rights to the U.S. Administration to interfere on a global scale in the affairs of other sovereign states. To put it more simply -- to conduct overt and covert subversive operations against governments not to U.S. liking, to prepare and carry out undeclared wars against such states, and to implement a policy of state terrorism. The whole purport of "globalism" consists in achieving world supremacy on the basis of militant anti-Sovietism and struggle against states pursuing a policy not to U.S. liking. The latest example of this policy is the undisguised U.S. aggression against sovereign Libya. It is time to realize at last that the times are different now and that the sovereign rights of peoples and states, of medium and small countries cannot be disregarded. The opinion of states and peoples cannot be ignored now. At the 40th UN General Assembly Session, 151 states voted for a resolution calling for the arms race in space to be prevented. The United States abstained from voting for that resolution.

The Soviet Union has proposed to the world's countries and peoples that they enter the 3d millennium without nuclear arms and without "star wars." We also consider it a perfectly realistic task to get rid of all chemical weapons completely in this century. To ban the development and creation of weapons based on new physical principles. It is a question of weapons which have never been used before -- beam, radio wave, subsonic, and genetic weapons. Peace can be preserved, but space can be used only for peaceful purposes. This is the demand of the times, and there is no other alternative. Over to the U.S. Administration.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA REPORTS GORBACHEV MEETING WITH CONGRESSMEN

LD041549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 4 April received in the Kremlin Democrat Dante Fascell, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Republican Congressman William Broomfield. They stayed in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave a detailed evaluation of the state of Soviet-American relations since the Geneva summit meeting, and recalled and explained the motives behind the proposals and measures that were put forward by the Soviet Union over that period with the aim of consolidating the atmosphere of the Geneva meeting and starting the implementation of the joint statements made there and the accords reached. He characterized the conduct of the American side over that period as being in conflict with the accord expressed in Geneva on the fundamental issue -- the inadmissibility of nuclear war and of the striving for superiority over each other.

Mikhail Gorbachev again stressed the need for a new mode of thinking in world politics that presupposes not only mutual understanding, consideration of the true role, responsibility, and possibilities of the USSR and the United States, but also respect for the sovereignty and legitimate interests of all countries and peoples, and the exclusion of strong-arm tactics and threats from relations with them.

A detailed exchange of views was held on all aspects of Soviet-American relations with the sincere wish to understand the specific features of the approach in each of the countries and the recognition of the fundamental difference between the social systems to which they belong.

The mutual striving was expressed for Soviet-American contacts in various fields to understand each other better and more correctly. The conviction was expressed of the need to carry on the summit dialogue started in Geneva, but it should be an effective dialogue providing for concrete steps to end the arms race and eliminated the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev said, is prepared to reach agreement on an equal footing, without detriment to anybody, on any problems and expects the same preparedness from the United States.

Due attention was devoted to humanitarian issues. The American guests were briefed on the Soviet Union's principled stand in that field.

Present at the meeting were Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Arthur Hartman, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV SPEECH AT VOLGA CAR WORKS

LD090034 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1723 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at an 8 April meeting at the Volga Car Works in Tolyatti, Kuybyshev Oblast: Gorbachev shown speaking at podium, with shots of audience interspersed; from the "Vremya" newscast--recorded]

[Excerpt] Comrades, now to international affairs -- the last part of my speech.

The other day I had a meeting with U.S. congressmen and promised them I would also tell you what I told them. We do not have two policies; we have one policy that expresses the interests of the Soviet people and takes account of the interests of all other peoples.

The 27th CPSU Congress produced a comprehensive analysis of all the controversies and relationships in today's world. What is needed to resolve its problems is an entirely new way of thinking, an innovative approach, and an awareness of the fact that the arms race and the development of military technology have reached a critical point. This is what we proceed from. In so doing, we understand that we exist side by side in world politics with an opposite system in class terms and are confronted by just as serious a reality from the point of view of safeguarding peace as the United States. Meanwhile, the leadership of that country cannot drop past habits and, to all appearances, does not want to reckon with the reality of the USSR. This fact, however, does not stop us from seeking a way out of confrontation. For there is simply no alternative. The other alternative is a race toward nuclear catastrophe. Our conduct and our policy are prompted not only by our principles and morality but also by the fact that we understand that any other approach is unrealistic. That is why, at the decision of the party Central Committee, I went to Paris and Geneva. That is why the Soviet Union has put forward an entire series of major initiatives. That is why we set out, immediately after Geneva, to translate the accords and the joint statement achieved there into practical actions.

Twice, we extended our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and offered to immediately begin talks on ending nuclear tests altogether. We put forward compromise proposals, meeting the West halfway at the Vienna and Stockholm conferences. Another major initiative was our statement of 15 January that contained a concrete and clear plan for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and for reductions in other weapons to limits necessary for defence. We have taken account of the Europeans' worry about medium-range missiles and operational tactical nuclear weapons and came up with a compromise option for the European zone. We suggested the mutual withdrawal of the Soviet and U.S. navies from the Mediterranean. The 27th CPSU Congress not only approved all these measures but also formulated basic principles for the establishment of a comprehensive international security system.

But what about the West, on whose an end to the arms race and at any moment in the international climate also directly depends. How have they been behaving since Geneva? What is their policy? To begin with, we have not received a satisfactory reply to the statement of January 15; what they have sent us evades the heart of the matter and attempts to make do with half-measures and to mislead the world public with vague promises.

As for a reply on substance, it is being supplied by the actions of the United States and by the actual policy of NATO. In Geneva, both sides agreed that there would be no winners in a nuclear war, just as in the nuclear arms race. However, when we put forward a simple and clear stage-by-stage plan for the reduction and elimination of the nuclear arms arsenals, we were told "No."

Or else, they have kept harping over the years that the Russians cannot be trusted because they do not permit on-site inspection. We have agreed to it. In response, President Reagan offers to verify not a ban on nuclear explosions but the procedure of improving nuclear weapons. As a U.S. newspaper aptly remarked the other day, it is the same as asking a man advocating the abolition of capital punishment to witness an execution.

We, naturally, have not accepted and will not accept it. We put the matter differently. Let us discuss both our proposal on

ending explosions and the U.S. program of militarization. The only thing the U.S. Administration seems to have left from Geneva is talk about a new meeting between the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. To make the matter absolutely clear, I will repeat again: We stand for holding such a meeting. We make no preconditions for it. However, we want it to pass in accordance with what the President and I agreed on, namely, it should mark a step forward, that is, produce practical results toward ending the arms race.

One more thing. It can take place if the atmosphere of Geneva is preserved or, it would be more correct to say, restored. But look at what is taking place. Shortly after Geneva, an anti-Soviet campaign was relaunched with new force in the United States, full of every type of fabrication and insult to our state.

Then, most serious practical actions—namely, the demand that the Soviet Union reduce the number of its diplomats in New York by 40 percent. A U.S. naval squadron appeared off the shores of the Crimea; they made it plain the action was sanctioned by the top authorities. An attack was carried out against Libya to show U.S. might and to demonstrate that it is, allegedly, at liberty to do whatever it wishes. A high-yield nuclear explosion is being carried out in Nevada with an obviously provocative purpose on the eve of the expiration of our moratorium. And when we proposed a meeting without delay on just one truly urgent question, that of nuclear explosions, it took less than 24 hours to answer "No."

Do they in Washington think that they are dealing with lame brains? Do they believe that today it is possible to behave like [illegible]? Is this how they in the United States understand the spirit of Geneva? Do they think that we do not see how the just started Soviet-U.S. dialogue is being misused to cover the implementation of military plans? All this makes one wonder, involuntarily, what content and what meaning Washington is imparting to a new Soviet-U.S. meeting.

And what about Western Europe? In reply to our proposals, which are also meeting the wishes of the European public and many governments, they are now saying to us: The U.S. missiles cannot be removed from Europe because the Soviet Union, supposedly, has more conventional weapons. But our January statement unambiguously also offers reductions in conventional weapons and armed forces.

They also say another thing: The United States, they say, will have to take the missiles across the ocean while Moscow will merely ship them to Siberia, from which they can be easily and promptly carried back. In so doing, they pretend not to know that the USSR offers the elimination of the missiles rather than their transfer anywhere. In sum, they stand for peace in words, but for missiles in fact. No, evidently neither Britain nor France is displaying a serious approach here.

Take the attitude toward the Strategic Defense Initiative. The West European governments and big business are using all sorts of pretexts for becoming increasingly involved in this disastrous plan and are thus becoming a companion in a new, even more dangerous round of the arms race.

Finally, perhaps, the most important point. The United States is moving its "star wars" program into full gear. The President claims this is a defensive and non-nuclear program. But the general in charge of this project publicly describes how the space weapons will hit the enemy on earth, while the U.S. defense secretary says it also includes nuclear components.

I say frankly that if the United States persists in that course, contrary to common sense, we will find a convincing response and not necessarily in space. [applause] We know well the potential of contemporary science and our own potential. Those asserting that the United States can do that are mistaken. We can do everything [applause] We can do everything if the situation turns out like that. But we are against such a chance. We are against the absurd U.S. [illegible] logic. To put a bet on space strike weapons is not a problem of [illegible] but a problem of responsibility.

I wish to say the following in this connection: It is time to give up building relations with the USSR on erroneous concepts, on illusions. One of the most dangerous such illusions is that the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions and calls are evaluated as a sign of weakness. Well then, the arms race will [illegible], we will not be [illegible] from outer space and will not be [illegible] in technology. Nothing good will come of those [illegible] [applause]

As is evident from numerous letters coming in to the Central Committee, quite a few of our people are concerned about whether it will happen that, under cover of conversations about peace and Geneva talks, the West will make a spurt forward in arms that we will not manage to react to. I can assure you, comrades, this will not happen. [applause] It will not happen because the Soviet leadership clearly sees the difference between words and deeds. [applause] The policy of the Soviet Union takes into account the entire sum total of such factors. We will not be taken unawares. The Soviet State has repeatedly proven that it will be able to meet any challenge. If need be, it will also respond in due manner this time. [applause] We do not claim greater security, as the 27th congress placed on record. However, we will not agree to less security either.

Nobody, certainly, expected that the implementation of our program of advancement toward peace without wars and weapons would proceed smoothly, like a Zhiguli car running on a good asphalt road. [laughter] We are in for a long, tough struggle. Not only deeds, but even a warming in Soviet-U.S. relations does not suit certain circles. They are trying to find any pretext to wreck the improvement in the international situation that began to manifest itself after Geneva. The whole world knows who they are. They are the circles associated with the military business, those who personify the military-industrial complex, sending its representatives to the upper echelons of power and taking them back after they loyally serve it there. They are those who earn billions on the arms race and confrontation.

At the congress we outlined the main directions in the struggle against nuclear war, and we will act consistently and perseveringly. We have great opportunities.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] April 1985

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SUPREME SOVIET DEPUTY ON PARLIAMENT APPEAL TO [illegible]

LD101774 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Video talk by [illegible], USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and rector of Bauman Technical Higher School in Moscow--from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An appeal to the U.S. Administration once again has resounded from the highest level of our country's leadership. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev already has called express times for an end to the hopeless [illegible] which is continuously increasing the danger of catastrophic consequences. It would appear that it is clear to see to everyone that the quantity of nuclear weapons accumulated on earth is much greater than that which can lead civilization to destruction. Life, which has been developing on earth for hundreds of millions of years, has reached the most dangerous frontier.

U.S. militarist theoreticians cynically call the present situation one of guaranteed destruction. Further perfecting and accumulating nuclear weapons is senseless. It now has become dangerous even to maintain the stocks already set up. The technical slip, any miscalculation, a reckless decision by someone invested with power might prove sufficient to start a nuclear war. Our generation bears special responsibility before each of us in this matter. It was in our time that weapons of global destruction were created and we must eliminate them. It is not yet too late.

We are convinced we have to make an appeal above all to us as delegates to people who by virtue of their official positions are pledged to subordinate their activity to the interests of the peoples and who are pledged primarily to create conditions for their normal secure life. We are happy the Soviet Government occupies an indisputable position on this matter. The position is in accordance with the interests of the entire Soviet people and, I am sure, with those of all peoples on earth.

We understand that advocating such a position demands a great deal of self-possession and patience. But we are hoping these efforts will produce positive results.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recently once again put forward a proposal to meet the U.S. President in any European country, and we call upon the U.S.

[illegible]

[illegible]

MOSCOW: DISARMAMENT NOT ON AGENDA OF NATO MEETING

[illegible] Moscow in English to North America [illegible]

Commentary by Georgiy Zubkov

[Text] NATO defense ministers are presently a meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group in Wuerzburg, Federal Germany. Their gathering follows a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty foreign ministers in Warsaw. The commentary is by Georgiy Zubkov.

At their meeting the socialist countries once again called for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. They proposed that the Soviet Union and the United States should take the lead by scrapping all their medium-range missiles in Europe. In a communique after the meeting, the foreign ministers said the next Soviet-American summit could achieve agreement on this problem and on that of ending nuclear weapons tests. Such a breakthrough would help in negotiations as well [illegible]. The Warsaw Treaty countries want to ensure that the scrapping of weapons of mass destruction should go hand in hand with cuts in conventional forces.

Now, what kind of positions have the NATO defense ministers brought to Wuerzburg? They're sitting behind closed doors, but one can form a fairly accurate picture of their positions from what the American, British, and West German ministers had to say before the meeting.

In a BBC interview on Wednesday, Defense Secretary Weinberger once again said his country would carry on with nuclear testing. As for Lt. General James Abrahamson, director of the Star Wars program, he told the ministers on Thursday that Western Europe, too, would have to accept space strike weapons being developed in his country. These might be ready for deployment even before the early 1990s as scheduled. From these remarks, it's clear that the NATO ministers are far from discussing how to bring about disarmament. Washington and NATO continue to rely on inventing ever new weapons and spreading their own preparations to outer space.

But a further arms buildup would only worsen the world situation which is dangerous as it is. What we need is political solutions and [illegible] to have peace and security in Europe, the two Americas, and the rest of the world. It's necessary to find mutually acceptable agreements at long last.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Bundestag [illegible] general [illegible], director of the organization for [illegible] the "Strategic Defense Initiative," received [illegible] pressure to [illegible] with a view to convincing them to [illegible] all the "[illegible]" programs, [illegible] to a [illegible] in [illegible]. For the sake of being [illegible] about the "[illegible]" in [illegible] activities, Washington's [illegible] distributed among the [illegible] participants the Managua's [illegible] program—the [illegible] "[illegible]."

It [illegible] to [illegible] that, on the eve of the [illegible]'s opening, the Managua [illegible] Ministry and the [illegible], [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] agreement [illegible] to [illegible] in their participation in the implementation of [illegible] for the militarization of space. Washington, London, and Bonn [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], and it happened also at the [illegible] session of the Nuclear Planning Group. The final [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for Washington's [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible].

The Soviet Government's [illegible] to continue to build up the country's [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. It is [illegible] that [illegible] the Reagan-[illegible] refused to give a positive answer to the Soviet peace initiatives [illegible] to nothing the [illegible] [illegible] of the planned [illegible] of nuclear weapons. Speaking in Hamburg, Soviet Minister of Defense Sergei Sokolov [illegible] that Schmidt's nuclear [illegible], which are planned to be supplied with the U.S. "Pershing" [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], "[illegible] to the [illegible] of [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]."

Having [illegible] its [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], Washington [illegible] to [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of nuclear weapons. In particular, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. The [illegible] of [illegible] nuclear weapons at the [illegible]. For this purpose, 108 [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible] have been [illegible] to the United States especially for Europe. The [illegible] nuclear [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible]. It is also planned to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] deployed in West Europe.

The [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] the military preparations pursued by the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] from Washington to leading to the further complication of the [illegible] situation and an increased danger of a nuclear [illegible]. This cannot fail to cause alarm among the progressive public not among all the world [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS: U.S., SOVIET LAWYERS ISSUE ARMS CONTROL STATEMENTS

LD011222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0640 GMT 1 Apr 86

[Correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy report]

[Excerpts] Washington, 1 Apr (TASS)--The fourth annual meeting between Soviet and U.S. lawyers on the problems of limiting armaments concluded here on Monday [31 March]. Taking part in it were a delegation from the U.S. organization the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control and the Association of Soviet Jurists. Over the course of 1 week legal matters were discussed concerning the observance of arms control in the sphere of limiting armaments and also problems relating to strengthening cooperation and mutual understanding between the two countries.

At a news conference which took place on Monday the participants at the meeting distributed a joint message to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, and also to the letters of the highest legislative bodies of the two countries. The document points out that the delegations of Soviet and U.S. lawyers oppose the arms race in space and in this regard they consider the complete banning of antisatellite weapons testing to be necessary. Such a ban, the message says, would not only facilitate keeping space peaceful but would also alleviate efforts for nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

At the news conference the participants also distributed four joint statements on the need for the 1972 USSR-U.S. agreement on limiting antimissile defense systems to be observed and on the need to adopt measures aimed at achieving a universal and complete nuclear test ban, to ban antisatellite weapons, and generally to improve bilateral relations in various fields.

Vadim Sobakin, head of the Soviet delegation and vice president of the Association of Soviet Jurists, said the participants at the meeting are convinced that the security of our countries cannot be built on the basis of the use of force; it can only be built on the principle of equal rights. Our dialogue was useful and constructive, he noted.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR PAPER CONSIDERS SOVIET-U.S. DIALOGUE SINCE GENEVA

PM061440 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Apr 86 p 3

["View of Events" by political observer Sparktak Beglov: "Equal to the Responsibility"]

[Excerpt] Age-old experience suggests that particular laws can be traced in the policies of each state.

There is one "law" in Washington's foreign policy that our changing, multifaceted world categorically cannot tolerate. Let us look at the events of recent weeks. A well known law of physics manifests itself in these events with quite obvious regularity: action and reaction.

Indeed. As soon as a ray of light appears in the clouds on the international horizon the U.S. leadership seizes on any methods to once again muddy the situation and increase tension.

As soon as the USSR puts forward a far-reaching new proposal in the nuclear disarmament sphere like the 15 January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Washington and its partners suddenly begin displaying an unusual attachment to nuclear weapons. According to her statement of 31 March, Mrs Thatcher simply "cannot imagine a world without nuclear weapons" (!). And this comes after so many verbal incantations from across the ocean and from the banks of the Thames and the Rhine regarding the necessity to rid the world of the nuclear threat.

As soon as within the course of negotiations the USSR goes halfway to meet the United States and its allies, the latter either renounce their own proposals or present the world with faits accomplis such as the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada.

At the summit meeting in Geneva and from the rostrum of the 27th CPSU Congress it was honestly and openly said: The USSR is fully determined to achieve a breakthrough for the better in world affairs and will seek this by its every action.

Precisely such a major step could be a joint accord between the USSR and the United States on ceasing all nuclear tests. What would happen in this case? The control circuit on the conveyor belt of the arms race would be broken and disconnected. Arsenals would cease to be replenished with increasingly sophisticated instruments of war. Consequently, the most favorable conditions would be created for embarking on real disarmament measures. People in the USSR, as throughout the world, continue to hope that the U.S. side has not yet said the last word in connection with the Soviet proposal.

This week has even more clearly highlighted the opposition between the two approaches to the future destiny of the dialogue begun in November at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and to the content and purposefulness of such meetings. And was it just chance that at the press conference held in the Soviet capital at the beginning of this week virtually half the questions put by correspondents revealed an interest in what will happen next to the "spirit of Geneva"? How does Moscow view the prospects of the next summit meeting, which it is planned will take the shape of an official visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to United States?

The sincere interest and concern shown by the questions asked not only be professional politicians and journalists, but also by millions of ordinary people are understandable. But these questions must be directed first and foremost at the U.S. leadership.

As far as the Soviet side is concerned, it entered a dialogue with the United States on the basis of the firm belief that without normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations, without finding common points of departure for progress toward disarmament, a general improvement in the international situation is also impossible. Important points of departure were found in November in Geneva. These were the two leaders' agreement that nuclear war is inadmissible, as is any aspiration to military superiority. Because there can be no victors either in an all-destroying war or in an insane arms race.

Since the November meeting the expression "the Geneva process" has come into circulation. What is this process? It is dialogue and a process of talks at summit level. It presupposes that at every stage there will be a qualitative increase in decisions made in favor of peace and disarmament. Since the initial milestones of consensus have been established, the next meeting will appear worthwhile in the eyes of the whole world only if it is marked by practical decisions, decisions leading to accords on curtailing nuclear arsenals. It is clear that such an approach implies a mutual, clearly expressed readiness to work toward this result and to bolster this readiness in everyday policy. It is not difficult to see that our country acts precisely in this way, that it interprets the purpose and content of dialogue with the United States precisely this way, and that this is our guideline in the light of the new summit meeting planned for this year within the framework of the "Geneva process."

Considering the consistency of the course adopted by the Soviet Union to achieve this aim, the world public has a right to ask the question: What is the U.S. side driving at? Especially in light of Washington's latest abuses of crude force and its "automatic" negative reaction to Moscow's proposal to stop the buildup of nuclear weapons. In this connection a considerable number of people are also questioning the sincerity of President Reagan's statements last November about his desire for peace. They are greatly at variance with the real actions of the U.S. Administration. Or does the master of the White House no longer feel like "peacemaking" and are his hands full with the control panel of the arms race?

Washington journalist Mary McGrory recently offered the following version: Having appeased the American masses with his trip to Geneva, President Reagan is now, she says, solely acting to appease his supporters on the right wing. He is suggesting that dialogue with the USSR will not, he claims, have serious consequences for the U.S. arms buildup program.

Every policy has its own nature, its own social roots. Indeed, many of Washington's actions proclaim themselves so loudly that at times they drown out the voice of common sense even in America itself. It is not difficult to understand why the U.S. leadership feels so uncomfortable in the face of the simple and specific Soviet proposals. Some

people in the ruling U.S. grouping are afraid that the curtailment of the arms race will become reality. Once again Moscow is intimating to Washington with the utmost firmness and determination: Strong-arm methods have never succeeded against our state before, and now they are simply laughable.

Proposals in the spirit of an honest and open policy are a kind of "moment of truth." The constructive action program put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress is precisely such a test of truth. It is a test of the sense of responsibility. Matters in the world will proceed much more rapidly and confidently along the path of normalization if the U.S. Administration is open to this understanding and responsibility. "And we call on the President, the U.S. Government, and Congress to show political will and seek ways of normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations, developing them, and improving the situation as a whole," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his replies to questions from the African weekly REVOLUTION AFRICAINE.

At a time of a complex and, to a great extent, crucial situation in international affairs our country continues to firmly adhere to the course of ensuring that a breakthrough does happen, and that it is definitely a turn for the better.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZORIN PONDERS U.S. 'CAMPAIGN' AGAINST SUMMIT

LD060505 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 5 Apr 86

["Moscow Viewpoint," by commentator Valentin Zorin]

[Text] The episode I've been reflecting on these days took place in Geneva at the end of last November. Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev had just left the Geneva airport and journalists were exchanging impressions of the summit. An American commentator remarked that not everybody in the United States would like the agreements achieved at the summit, for instance the agreement on more meetings of the two leaders. The journalists said we could believe him that there were influential people in his country who would not like that at all and would try to prevent another summit, at least in the nearest future.

The more I think of the conversation, the more it seems to me that the pessimistic forecast made at the Geneva airport is coming true. Indeed, a whole series of events of the not very distant past cannot but create an impression that somebody in Washington tries to put as many obstacles as possible in the way of a Soviet-American summit scheduled for this year. In Nevada a nuclear explosion has been carried out in answer to Mikhail Gorbachev's insistent calls for signing a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban. American warships have made a provocative voyage towards the USSR's Black Sea coast. And shortly before that there was that sudden demand from the American Administration that the Soviet Union reduce its staff at the U.N. headquarters in New York. All this suggests a carefully planned campaign testifying to the fact that Washington has departed from the Geneva agreements.

In a word, Washington has tried to apply the brakes, if not to go into reverse, and this is seen in the negative reaction of the American Administration to the Soviet proposal for a summit in the nearest future to negotiate a ban on nuclear testing. Washington has shown no intention to meet in [as heard] Moscow halfway in the matter of nuclear disarmament. Why? This is a puzzle for many in the Soviet Union, in the United States itself and in other countries. Some say that President Reagan overestimated his capabilities when he agreed in Geneva that neither side should seek military superiority. Others suppose that the President underestimated the influence of those who feared that they would sustain losses if the arms race is put under control by a Soviet-American agreement. It's also possible that the President was insincere when he talked of peace and the need to improve Soviet American relations and curb the arms race, and that his main concern was not so much to achieve an agreement as to score as many propaganda points as possible.

But which explanation is closer to the truth? Whatever the answer, one thing is obvious. Washington over the past few weeks has been carrying out a planned campaign to worsen the international situation and to reduce to nothing the very possibility of another Soviet-American summit.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: UK'S HOWE TURNS DEAF EAR TO SOVIET INITIATIVE

LD212345 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Interview with commentator Nikolay Borin by unidentified presenter]

[Text] One of last week's main news stories was speech by the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, in which he formulated the government's answer to the Soviet peace initiatives. Now I'm going to put several questions concerning the issue to our commentator, Nikolay Borin, and the first one is this:

[Interviewer] The British foreign secretary rejected the plans for eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe on the pretext that without nuclear weapons the West European countries would face a Soviet supremacy in conventional arms. What would you say about this argument?

[Borin] The communique following the session of the Warsaw Treaty foreign ministers, which ended yesterday, said that the elimination of weapons of mass destruction must proceed together with the reduction in conventional arms. What we therefore have in mind is certainly not stopping the arms race in one direction for it to start in another. As for the Warsaw Treaty supremacy in conventional armaments, this is nothing but a widespread myth. NATO armed strength is 5,600,000 men, whereas the Warsaw Treaty organization only has 4,900,000 men. NATO also has more divisions ready for combat. By the way, their numerical strength is likewide greater than that of the divisions of the Warsaw Treaty organization.

There are 2,000 American tanks and 6,500 tanks of the West European countries in Europe, so the Warsaw Treaty countries have no advantage over NATO in tanks, either. Of course, one cannot expect symmetry everywhere. We say there is a rough parity in conventional forces. With this in mind the socialist countries have, at the Vienna talks on reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, suggested that the Soviet Union and the United States reduce the strength of their forces in Central Europe within 12 months and then pledge not to increase them for 3 years.

Sir Geoffrey must have turned a deaf ear to the proposals by the Soviet Union and its allies, because his aim was to reject the Soviet initiatives for scrapping nuclear weapons in Europe.

[Interviewer] But both the prime minister and the foreign secretary have expressed the same idea, that British nuclear forces mustn't be a matter of discussion in solving the problem of Soviet and American nuclear weapons in Europe. Some observers believe that London and Washington coordinated their actions in advance to block the Soviet peace plan.

[Zorin] That's true, but it's not only observers who make such remarks, the British opposition did so as well. In my view London is kicking at an open door, because Moscow's proposal places the British nuclear forces beyond the bounds of the reduction process for several years to come--the time during which the United States and the Soviet Union would scrap their missiles in Europe and cut their strategic forces by 50 percent. The just adopted Warsaw Treaty communique suggests that Britain and France should only refrain from modernizing their nuclear forces so that the process of reducing both medium-range and tactical missiles can start successfully.

Let me point out in this context that the modernization of Britain's nuclear forces is likely to increase its nuclear potential threefold. Britain, you probably remember, has already substantially increased its nuclear strength by the beginning of the eighties when it armed its Polarisms with new Chevaline warheads, following a series of nuclear tests.

[Interviewer] Now you've mentioned the issue of nuclear tests. Sir Geoffrey said he had reservations about how effectively a treaty banning them can be verified, so is this the reason why London has shown little enthusiasm about the call from Moscow and now from all the Warsaw Treaty countries for resuming trilateral negotiations on banning nuclear explosions?

[Zorin] The technical facilities for accurately identifying underground nuclear explosions, even at the range of thousands of miles, were developed years ago. Moreover, the Soviet Union announced last December that it will be prepared to negotiate on-site inspections with the United States if there were a mutual moratorium. Arguments to the effect that verification would be inadequate simply do not hold water. The real motive behind them is to block any attempts to scale down the level of confrontation in Europe, to reject any proposals coming from the Warsaw Treaty organization. But you who move so all the time would never solve any problem.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1331

CONSERVATIVES FIRMS ON "SOLIDARITY" WITH U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY

PM[illegible] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian [illegible] Apr 86 Morning Edition p [illegible]

[Own correspondent A. [illegible] dispatch: "To Please 'Big Brother'"]

[Text] London -- Whitehall did not react to the provocative explosion of the nuclear device in Nevada in any way, although the media [illegible] "transmitted" the consternation to Britain's [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. It is difficult for London officialdom to express surprise, let alone dissatisfaction, on this subject. The Tories' stance on this issue was decided a long time ago.

The White House could be sure on this occasion too that at the crucial moment its most disciplined and devoted ally would cause the Washington administration no trouble. On the contrary, it would set an example to the other Atlantic partners how unreserved NATO solidarity must be demonstrated.

You get the impression that the Conservative government, which until quite recently displayed the will to think and act independently in the international arena in individual cases, has now definitively decided to leave this sphere to others. If this were just a matter of bilateral relations between Great Britain and the United States it would not be so bad because it would concern Britain alone, even though it is true that it would dent their sense of national pride. In the given case the negative consequences of the readiness to cooperate are much more far-reaching.

The Tory authorities must be aware that the provocatively demonstrative series of the nuclear tests in Nevada is designed to thwart the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on ending nuclear weapons tests. In this context, it is possible to say with full justification: By carrying out the explosions in a U.S. state, the United States wanted to undermine the hopes of peace-loving people at home, in Britain, and everywhere that the nuclear race may be stopped. D. Fisk, a well-known London diplomatic commentator has correctly remarked: "The United States does not intend to conclude a test ban treaty even if acceptable verification [proverka] methods which inspire trust are submitted for negotiation."

These words express the essence of the problem precisely. Washington is trying to [illegible] any obstacles on [illegible] path toward [illegible], militarism, and [illegible], and by toeing the line, the Thatcher government has [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TASS ASSAILS [illegible] U.S., SOVIET CHEMICAL [illegible] STANCE

[illegible] Moscow TASS in English [illegible] GMT 4 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

United States Ambassador Donald Lowitz, addressing the Geneva conference on disarmament, [illegible] described to the delegates the "[illegible]", "[illegible]" and [illegible] "[illegible]" over the Soviet proposals for a comprehensive chemical weapons ban.

The head of the American delegation claimed that the latest Soviet initiatives aimed to eliminate chemical weapons proved to be "insufficient", while the Soviet verification proposals were mere words.

For many years, the United States has refused to agree to a mutually acceptable accord banning chemical weapons, claiming that verification was [illegible] [illegible], but [illegible] [illegible]. As a matter of fact, it denied the possibility of ending the race of chemical arms.

Later on, compelled to reckon with world public opinion, the U.S. administration came up with statements expressing its sincere desire to work out a convention on the effective prohibition of the development, production and accumulation of chemical weapons and on their subsequent total destruction.

Nevertheless, American officials "said" that before [illegible] chemical weapons, the United States has to build up its arsenals of toxic agents in order to create a stimulus for the Russians to hold the talks.

The White House responded to the socialist countries' proposals for banning chemical weapons by new programmes of expanding the production of nerve gases and developing fundamentally new binary munitions.

The American side, at the talks in Geneva and other forums, always insisted on the issue of "on-site verification", apparently regarding the problem as a chance for justifying its own obstructionist stand with regard to chemical weapons. Washington's calculations collapsed after the publication of the latest Soviet initiatives.

The Soviet programme for banning chemical weapons provides, in particular, for the declaration by the sides of the location of enterprises producing toxic agents and for the termination of their production. It calls for beginning the elaboration of the procedures on destroying their production base and destroying, soon after the convention

enters into force, the stockpiles of chemical weapons. All these measures would be carried out under strict international control, including international on-site verification.

The leaders of the USSR stress that control over compliance with a chemical weapons agreement is no problem for the Soviet Union. Highly assessing the latest Soviet initiatives, the London DAILY TELEGRAPH observed that never before for several decades had the chances for success at the talks been so good. That obviously worried American officials in Washington and the head of the American delegation at the Geneva conference on disarmament.

The U.S. Administration made it a rule lately to accuse the Soviet Union of the sins against peace itself was committing. Washington resorted to the same tactics during the debate on chemical weapons. The U.S. Administration is committed to intensive nuclear tests at a time when the Soviet Union has stuck to its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts for eight months. This does not prevent Washington from blaming the Soviet Union for the absence of an accord banning nuclear explosions.

The United States openly violates the SALT-II Treaty and routinely describes it as a "pseudo arms control agreement". Hardly a day passes without the administration officials advancing absurd charges of non-compliance against the Soviet Union. The United States is preparing to deploy strike armaments, including nuclear weapons, in outer space, while seeking to place the responsibility for the militarization of space on the Soviet Union. Washington's propaganda tricks fully stem from the U.S. Administration's obstructionist position on the entire range of arms reduction and limitation problems.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1326

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS REVIEWS U.S. ROLE IN CHEMICAL WEAPONS BAN

LD090649 Moscow TASS in English 0619 GMT 9 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS -- by TASS commentator Valeriy Abarenkov.

The convention on the prohibition of the development production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction was opened for signing 14 years ago, on April 10, 1972.

In 1975, the convention entered into force.

The USSR and its allies proposed a simultaneous ban on bacteriological and chemical weapons, because both were directed at destroying people, all living things. The stance of the Western countries, first of all the United States, prevented that.

Nevertheless, the convention became the first practical step towards disarmament: It provided for the destruction of a whole group of the most dangerous weapon of mass annihilation.

Moreover, the parties to the convention undertook the pledge to continue talks in good faith with a view to prohibiting chemical weapons as well.

Regrettably, the aim has not been achieved so far, and not because the problem of banning chemical weapons has lost its significance. On the contrary. There were only five countries which possessed chemical weapons in 1963. Now their number is 13-15.

The world is facing the threat of the production of new, ever more deadly types of chemical weapon -- binary ones. The Reagan administration is seeking congressional approval for their production, banned by Congress from 1969.

Congress seems to be giving in, although with several reservations. It is clear that such a step will only complicate the current talks on prohibiting chemical weapons.

The problem of banning chemical weapons is beset with difficulties due to the character of chemical production, which makes it hard to verify compliance with an agreement.

Statesmanlike approach should prevail here. It should be based, firstly on the firm commitment to seek the prohibition of chemical weapons, and, secondly, on the aspiration to create a proper political atmosphere that would facilitate advancement towards this objective.

Concrete ideas and proposals have already been advanced: to create zones free from chemical weapons, for instance, in Europe, or to agree on the further non-proliferation of these weapons.

The main thing is that actions in this area should not lose from sight the central task of ultimately banning chemical weapons.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1326

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET MBFR DELEGATE ADDRESSES MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE

LD251823 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 25 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- "The stand that the USA and its allies in NATO have held throughout the latest round of the Vienna talks cannot be qualified as constructive". Valerian Mikhailov, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, head of the Soviet delegation at the Vienna talks on forces and armaments reduction in Central Europe, said this in the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry, addressing Soviet and foreign correspondents today. "Having formally accepted the scheme of initial arrangement proposed by socialist countries, the Western side, in reality, is stubbornly trying to adjust it to its previous obstructionist positions. If it alters anything in them at all, it is only in the direction of their toughening."

"The United States and its closest allies continue reducing to the minimum everything that could indeed carry the matters to a real lowering of the level of military confrontation. Alongside this they arbitrarily and unjustifiably manipulate with measures of verification and control, deliberately bringing them to unrealistic limits that are obviously unacceptable, and thus stalling the talks again".

"The Western side reduced to the minimum the volume of subsequent troop cutbacks", Valerian Mikhaylov siad. "And the West refuses categorically to reduce armaments, alongside forces. The West does not wish either that the obligation to freeze the levels of forces in Central Europe for three years simultaneously apply to armaments".

"As to verification and control, the NATO representatives simply lose all sense of proportion and reasonable realism. For instance, they insist on the exchange of information on the structure of troops down to a batallion and barracks and on the holding of 30 inspections a year for its verification, even though these demands are not at all commensurate either with the nature and content of planned agreement, or with real needs for the ensurance of its implementation, or with specific features of present-day military and political situation."

"Striving to base the talks in Vienna on a realistic and constructive foundation, the Warsaw Treaty member states, as is known, submitted on February 20 of this year their detailed draft 'agreement on the initial reduction of land forces and armaments by the Soviet Union and the United States with subsequently keeping from increasing the levels of forces and armaments and on related measures in Central Europe'", Valerian Mikhaylov said.

"The Warsaw Treaty countries' draft largely develops and specifies the proposals of socialist countries advanced earlier. The draft envisages new steps to meet Western

partners halfway on such questions as the volume of initial cutbacks, the exchange in advance of the list of military units that are being cut back or withdrawn, the setting up of three or four permanent check points for the entry of troops into the cutback areas or their withdrawal out of those areas throughout the operation of the agreement, the exchange of information of the volumes of forces that are not to be built up, the possibilities for on-site verification upon a justifiable inquiry, the creation of the mechanism of consulations on the observance of the agreement."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1327

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET VIEWS ON NFZ PRESENTED TO SOUTH PACIFIC FORUM

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 86 p 4

[Article: "Consultations on Questions of a Nuclear Free Zone in the South Pacific"]

[Text] On 3-4 February, consultations were held in the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry with a delegation from the South Pacific Forum (SPF) on questions dealing with the Agreement on a Non-Nuclear Zone in the South Pacific and protocols to this agreement.

The Soviet side explained the concept of a nuclear-free world as presented in the Announcement of CPSU Central Committee Secretary General M. S. Gorbachev dated 15 January. It was stressed that the implementation of the program of complete liquidation of nuclear weapons in the entire world with nonadmittance of the appearance of space strike weapons would lead to a radical improvement in the international situation on a long-term and stable basis. Attention was also focused on the USSR decision to extend until 31 March of this year the previously announced unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts. Thus, a favorable possibility has been created for stopping nuclear testing and for immediately proceeding ahead to the conclusion of an international agreement on a total and general ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

The SPF delegation gave a high evaluation to the complex of important initiatives presented in the Announcement of M. S. Gorbachev, which evoked great interest among the countries of the South Pacific region. The SPF delegation greeted the prolonging of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts and noted that the countries of the SPF firmly speak out in favor of total cessation of nuclear testing by all the nuclear powers.

The Soviet side noted that the USSR is considering the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world as an important measure in the struggle for narrowing the sphere of nuclear preparations. In its attitude toward nuclear-free zones, the Soviet Union makes no exceptions for any states, be they participants or nonparticipants in military alliances. If any party rejects the acquisition of nuclear weapons and does not have them on its territory, it will receive firm and effective guarantees from the USSR.

Based on this principle position, the Soviet side from the very beginning expressed a positive attitude toward the efforts of the states in the South Pacific for the creation of a nuclear-free zone.

In the course of the consultations with the Soviet side, it was announced that the creation of a zone free from nuclear weapons in the South Pacific is an important contribution to the formulation of a reliable system of security in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region. It restricts the geographic framework of the spread of nuclear weapons and facilitates the realization of the task of fully and forever doing away with nuclear weapons on earth and not allowing the arms race beyond its boundaries—in space. The Agreement on the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific Ocean, together with the protocols to it in their present form generally correspond to those criteria which are presented by the Soviet Union in regard to nuclear-free zones. It was noted with satisfaction that the agreement provides for the obligation to render support to the preservation of the effectiveness of the international conditions of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, based on the Agreement on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the system of guarantees by the International Atomic Energy Agency. At the same time, the Soviet side pointed out the importance of the fact that the agreement on creation of a nuclear-free zone really ensure the transformation of the territories of the states participating in it into a zone which is totally free of nuclear weapons. This presumes, in particular, the prohibition of transit of nuclear weapons and nuclear detonation devices through the territory of the nuclear-free zone, including also the entry into ports and airports by foreign military vessels and airplanes with nuclear weapons on board. A number of other concepts were presented to the SPF delegation, and questions were raised regarding individual statutes of the agreement and protocols to it.

The SPF delegation expressed its gratitude for the support by the Soviet Union for the decision of the SPF countries to declare the South Pacific Ocean as a nuclear-free zone. It also took into account the viewpoints of the Soviet side and gave the appropriate clarifications.

12322
CSO: 5200/1267

[illegible]

[illegible] TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSAL

[illegible] PUBLICITY PRAISES BULGAR BID IN ARMS PARTS

Moscow [illegible] in Russian No 2, Jan 86 pp 5-6

[Article by Lyubomir Savelov, Bulgarian publicist, [illegible] "The Balkans [illegible] Without Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] Recognizing their responsibility for the peaceful future of Europe, Bulgaria and Romania presented a proposal to the states of the Balkan peninsula to join forces in turning the Balkans into a zone free of chemical weapons. This appeal was presented by the top leaders of the two socialist countries Todor Zhivkov and Nikolae Ceausescu during their recent meeting in Bucharest. It contains a proposal to immediately begin talks on concluding the appropriate agreement between the Balkan countries on prohibiting the production, testing, acquisition and accumulation of any types of chemical weapons on their territory.

We examine the significance of this initiative in light of the common efforts of the countries of the socialist alliance which are aimed at easing international tensions and creating a strong system of security. Important links in this system would be the regional zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons which may be created in Northern and Central Europe, in the Balkans, and in other regions of Europe as well as other continents. This plan contains a number of specific proposals. Two years ago the Warsaw Pact member states proposed concluding an agreement on freeing Europe from chemical weapons. Specifically, it stressed that the application of poisonous substances under conditions of heavily populated Europe would lead to especially heavy consequences for the peaceful residents, as well as to contamination of large territories. Recently, the GDR and the CSSR presented a proposal to establish a zone free of chemical weapons in Central Europe. And now the new initiative by Bulgaria and Romania.

It is important right now to agree on ridding Europe of chemical weapons once and for all. After all, it is no secret that the Pentagon is developing a plan for storing a qualitatively new weapon of "quiet death" on the territory of our continent. These are binary shells capable of annihilating people over huge areas. This idea which is dangerous for Europe and for the entire world must be countermanded with the requirement of the people to entirely prohibit weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons.

The joint proposal by Bulgaria and Romania is an important contribution to this direction. The support of this initiative by the broad community of

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible] PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "[illegible] of Varna's Working People"]

[Excerpt] Varna, 5 Apr (TASS)—The CPSU delegation headed by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which is participating in the work of the 13th BCP Congress, today familiarized itself with the life and achievements of the working people of Varna—a large industrial, scientific, and cultural center in socialist Bulgaria.

A Bulgarian-Soviet friendship rally was held at the enterprise at which [illegible], delegation member and member of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke. On the CPSU delegation's behalf he cordially congratulated the workers, engineering and technical workers, and the combine's entire collective.

[illegible]

[illegible] 27th CPSU Congress and at the 13th BCP Congress. [illegible] the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the principled foundations for the creation of a comprehensive international security system formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress [illegible] in the world as a new contribution in [illegible] of peace policy.

International security [illegible] economic and [illegible] development of all countries [illegible] political or social systems. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] international security. [illegible]

[illegible]
CSO: [illegible]

RELATED ISSUES

NETHERLANDS PARLIAMENTARIAN MEETS WITH SOVIET OFFICIALS

Beide Talks With Yakovlev

[illegible] Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 3 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS — Lev Yakovlev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, today met with Beico Ter Beek, chairman of the standing Commission on Foreign Relations of the second chamber of the Dutch Parliament.

An opinion was expressed during the conversation that inter-parliamentary contacts contribute to developing relations between the two countries on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit, non-interference and respect for sovereignty.

An exchange of opinions took place on the more pressing problems of disarmament. Special attention was paid to the Soviet Union's latest proposals reflecting the genuine desire for fundamental improvements in the international situation and for a real step to ending the nuclear arms race.

Talks With Izgaldin

[illegible] Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 3 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS - Vadim Izgaldin, secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has met today with Beico Ter Beek, chairman of the Commission for Foreign Affairs of the second chamber of the Dutch Parliament. In the course of the talk the guest's attention was attracted to the USSR's latest peace initiatives containing a real programme for putting an end to the nuclear arms race and stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons. Special attention was devoted to the problem of general and complete ending of nuclear testing. Both sides expressed the view of the need for the speediest resolution of that issue, which is vital to the cause of peace and universal security.

[illegible]
CSO: [illegible]

RELATED ISSUES

VIENNA FORUM DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT ISSUES

PM081310 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Novikov dispatch: "Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] Vienna -- A dialogue meeting on problems of peace and security was held here at the initiative of the International Forum for Ties Between Peace-Loving Forces.

Taking part in it were representatives of more than 20 countries and a number of international organizations. The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician V.G. Afanasyev, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Ties Between Peace-Loving Forces.

The dialogue was opened by Romesh Chandra, president of the International Forum for Ties between Peace-Loving Forces. Representatives from all continents on the planet spoke about the most pressing task of our time -- to avert the threat of nuclear war and strengthen peace and peoples' security. The participants in the dialogue were unanimous in the desire to do everything to ensure that 1986, proclaimed as International Year of Peace by the United Nations, is marked by real progress for the better in international affairs.

The speakers emphasized that people of goodwill throughout the world appraised highly the program for the elimination of all arsenals of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century, put forward in the 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Participants in the dialogue also emphasized that the termination of nuclear tests offers a real way toward the termination of the arms race. This is precisely why the peoples approved the Soviet Union's initiative to unilaterally introduce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and its decision not to conduct any nuclear tests after 31 March provided the United States also does the same.

Maud Frolich, Sweden's representative at the Vienna forum, read an address from the Swedish Peace Movement, which cites an interview given by O. Palme on the day before his death. "Let us believe," he said, "in a mutual and verifiable ban on nuclear weapon tests. A test ban offers an opportunity and time for talks and deliberations. The verification of its observance must be stepped up. It is obvious that if all nuclear explosions are terminated we will live in a safer world. I see 1986 as a year of enormous possibilities, and we all must make our constructive contribution today to ensure that the existing potential materializes."

The participants in the Vienna dialogue meeting adopted a number of documents. One of them expresses indignation and alarm in connection with the U.S. intention to conduct another nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site 8 April. The documents which were adopted contain an appeal to step up the struggle for the elimination of the nuclear threat. It is necessary to act jointly. The main task now is to strengthen peace.

6091
CSO: 5200/1329

RELATED ISSUES

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX SYNOD ISSUES PEACE MESSAGE

LD081352 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- The present-day reality requires urgent measures to deliver mankind completely from the nuclear threat, the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Chruch said in a message on war and peace in a nuclear age.

The message was circulated at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the Moscow Patriarchate's publishing department today.

Speaking there, Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich said the Russian Orthodox Church, which is active in the worldwide peace-making movement, has found it essential "ahead of the 1,000 anniversary of the Christianization of Russia in 1988 to sum up the experience of the religious interpretation of the problems of war and peace and define the pressing tasks of saving peace and the very life on earth from destruction in a nuclear conflagration."

He said it has taken two years to draw up the message which contains such chapters as "Christian attitude to war" and "Christian understanding of peace" and sets forth the reasons for reinterpreting the views on war and peace.

The message said: "Our time is characterized by peoples' search for political and economic independence, for social justice, for the development of their own identities, for building such a society as will ensure life in dignity for its every member.

"But the legitimate desire of peoples to follow their own ways of development has been often met not with understanding but opposition on the part of many powers that be.

"A strongest manifestation of it is the policy pursued today by U.S. ruling circles. Ascribing the natural processes of liberation and development that go on in the world to the intervention of the Soviet Union, they maintain a policy of confrontation towards our country, reinforcing this policy by their search for military superiority, which has found its manifestation in the arms race.

"All this has led to the escalation of international tension and increased the threat of a nuclear war." Naturally enough, the message added, the increasing threat of war has caused profound concern among religious, public and political figures, scientists and many other peace-makers from all walks of life. It recalled that Christian world outlook has made a certain impact on international relations. "Both in theory and in practice, Christians have sought to realize in the world the principles of truth," the message remarked.

From the Christian point of view, it added, "The notion of moral truth in international relations should be based on the following basic principles: 1) love of one's neighbours, of one's people and homeland, 2) the recognition of the needs of other nations and 3) the conviction that the welfare of one's nation cannot be promoted by immoral means."

The commandment to live, it emphasized, should not serve to cover the evil. "It is absolutely impossible to interpret this appeal to be kind and humble in personal human relations in terms of spineless contemplation of atrocities and injustices being inflicted on our neighbours," the message said. It recalled the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were flattened by atomic bombings, and added:

"The disastrous physical consequences of a nuclear war are terrifying not only because an unpredictable number of people will be killed. They will be no less terrible for the survivors". That is why it is a moral imperative not to make first use of nuclear weapons, the message said.

A large part of the message dealt with the arms race, condemning it as "an inhuman waste of resources", natural, material and manpower.

"The arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, does not only bring the world nearer to a possible nuclear disaster," the message said. "Even today, it has become one of the most terrible evils which humanity has ever experienced. It reveals the sinful squander of resources which have been given by God to human beings for living and rational use."

The Holy Synod voiced approval for the program for bringing about disarmament and ridding the earth of nuclear weapons stage by stage by the end of this century, which was unveiled by the Soviet state in the middle of January 1986. The Soviet program provides for the USSR and the United States to jointly renounce the development of space strike weapons.

The message said: "We call upon the governments of all nuclear powers to gather courage to embark on the road of delivering the earth from nuclear weapons."

It stressed that outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The message defined the tasks of the Christians and non-religious peace-makers in protecting peace and justice for all mankind. It stressed the importance of detente, peaceful co-existence, respect for legal norms, first of all the U.N. Charter, and a search for ways of defusing political tension.

"The United Nations Organization has declared 1986 the year of peace," the message said. "We welcome this decision and hope that every state in the world will make in this year its own contribution to achieving a lasting, just and universal peace."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1329

RELATED ISSUES

USSR WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' ON DISARMAMENT

LD061645 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 6 Apr 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with All-Union Radio foreign policy commentators Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants, Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev]

[Excerpt] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades! A few days ago the Canadian GLOBE AND MAIL published a review of the international situation under the headline "Persistent Search for Peace by Moscow and Bellicosity by Washington." For us, such a comparison is nothing new, it is no discovery, but when a solid, bourgeois, newspaper says something like that, it is very symptomatic. In our times, if you are looking for war, you cannot build a policy enjoying popularity. In the West, the doctrine of mutual assured destruction, otherwise called the balance of terror, is widespread. But even those people who consider that balance to be salutary still want the terror to be less while retaining the balance. And that is what they find in the Soviet proposals, which is why the persistent, tireless, and consistent efforts by our country aimed at halting the arms race and putting it into reverse give rise to response like that from the GLOBE AND MAIL. I quoted our Canadian colleagues because they put it in the most concise and clear ways.

Ideas in the same spirit can be found also in the U.S. press, in particular, profound regret that the U.S. leadership, that once assumed an obligation to do everything it could to bring about the complete and universal ending of nuclear tests, is rejecting, and demonstratively rejecting, the Soviet initiatives which are aimed at this. These initiatives are backed up by unilateral measures and a maximum show of goodwill. On one hand the Soviet Union proposed an all-embracing program of disarmament, and at the same time it showed its readiness to settle individual questions. Now it has brought the termination of nuclear explosions into the focus of attention.

[Agayants] Why does the Soviet Union attach such enormous importance to this problem? First, without such tests it is impossible either to improve nuclear weapons or to create new ones. A test ban would thus enable the whole process of nuclear disarmament to be brought out of deadlock. Second, the continuation of nuclear tests is doing enormous damage to nature and the environment that is still not completely understood. Third and last there is no need to start from scratch in this difficult business. A certain path has already been traveled: For many years now there have been no tests carried out in the air, the waters, on land, or in space.

One of the realities of the nuclear age today is the fact that it is simply impossible to resolve international conflicts by resorting to nuclear war, since there can be no winner. Consequently, such a war can in no way serve as an instrument for achieving any political aims. Moreover, the further continuation of the already head-spinning arms race is impairing both overall international security and the security of each individual state. That is why we are convinced that one of the most important measures that could have a beneficial influence on the political climate on our planet is the ending of nuclear tests. Unfortunately, however, one gets the impression that in Washington they have no wish to understand this. The Pentagon is stubbornly stepping up new nuclear tests, going against common sense, and against strong demands by the world public and by the U.S. public itself. The current U.S. Administration, as the events of this week show, is demonstrating an absence of political will to solve such a highly important problem of today as the renunciation of nuclear tests, and an absence of the necessary responsibility for the destiny of mankind.

[Levin] You know, comrades, in response to the latest proposal by the Soviet Union given in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement on television last Saturday, 1 week ago, U.S. representatives stated immediately that they had no wish to talk about any summit meeting to decide the question of ending nuclear tests, neither did they intend to talk about ending those tests. We hope that this is not the last word from the Washington administration, but to date that is how the situation is taking shape. Moreover, there are clear attempts by the United States to avoid giving an answer to the questions raised by the Soviet Union, and to find some sort of propaganda camouflage moves. The first move was the story that the Soviet Union, contrary to the Geneva accords -- here casting a shadow over our attitude toward the Geneva summit -- is rejecting the planned meeting and proposing another meeting instead devoted only a narrow question, and so on and so forth. The Soviet Union immediately made this matter completely clear. No, the meeting that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is suggesting be held in the immediate future to resolve the question of ending nulcear tests does not replace the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting planned for this year which is to take place in the United States to discuss a wide range of problems. Furthermore, other ideas were set in motion. A commentator for the U.S. NBC television company, for example, made the following statement regarding our initiative and the reaction by the United States. I quote this observer: To ask Ronald Reagan to end nuclear tests is the same as asking Imelda Marcos to stop buying new shoes.

[Sobolev] That is the wife of the Philippines dictator Marcos.

[Levin] That is right! That, you know, was in fact an attempt to turn the idea around, but the sense of the commentary was that, well, it is an absurd thing to ask of Reagan. Why on earth do the Russians, knowing full well that Reagan will give a negative answer, make such statements? But what we are counting on is common sense, a realistic understanding of the political and strategic situation that has come about in the world because of U.S. President Reagan. We make that proposal, not at all, as again they say in America, to score propaganda points, to drive the United States into a corner, or put it in a difficult position. No, that is not our aim at all. Our aim is to find a point of contact in attitudes, to develop a common point of view, and solve the problem of ending nuclear tests, because that is the first step on the path of eliminating nuclear weapons.

I would like to recall the foundation-laying documents that were adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress. The new edition of the party program says clearly and definitely that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union firmly and consistently upholds the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. We see our task as being the prevention of the threat of war. That is our principled policy. That is our chief aim. And that aim is far removed from any attempts to score points in the propaganda struggle. No, we do not want to drive Washington into a corner. If today it feels uncomfortable, then it is the fault of the U.S. Administration alone, its fault alone. But that is not our aim. We want to come to agreement with the United States, agreement on the problems which life itself today puts in the forefront.

[Sobolev] And problems on which at one time it seemed to express views that would enable agreement to be reached. In particular, during the Geneva meeting, the United States, in the person of President Reagan, expressed readiness to come to an agreement on the major problems of disarmament, and in particular the ending of nuclear tests could be the first step toward such accords. Unfortunately, however, as Comrade Gorbachev said in his interview with the Algerian magazine REVOLUTION AFRICAINE, Washington's actions following Geneva contradict the accords reached there. In the United States there is an increasing anti-Geneva syndrome which naturally creates no small number of difficulties for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. In particular that syndrome has been manifested in the increasing onslaught by the opponents of the SALT-II and ABM Treaties that the United States signed with the Soviet Union. Certain commissions compile completely groundless documents showing that the USSR is violating the limitations imposed by those agreements. A few days ago, however, there came to light a secret report by the U.S. special services for internal use which came to the conclusion that USSR is, in fact, not violating the treaties, but observing them.

But I repeat, although a secret report for internal use quietly says one thing, in the United States they are loudly saying something else. They assert, for example, that the USSR has 20-25 percent more warheads than the 2,500 fixed by SALT-II. Where does Washington get these figures, and why does it quote them? It is because another atomic-powered nuclear missile-carrying Trident submarine is going into service in the United States. So in order to keep to the level fixed by SALT-II, two other nuclear systems have to be dismantled -- two old Poseidon submarines. And so certain officials in Washington, quoting figures plucked out of thin air, are insisting that these submarines should not be dismantled but just put into dry dock, thus trying, by means of these submarines, to torpedo the clauses of the treaty. Also, as everyone knows, the ABM Treaty stands in the path of developing the star wars treaties is particularly great, and it is the passionate dream of the Washington neoconservatives to wreck them. A clear field, so to speak, would then be opened up for the arms race, that even in the ruling U.S. circles is far from an attractive thought for everyone.

[Levin] In the United States at the moment, again by falsifying the facts, they are attempting to create the impression that if the United States were to stop its nuclear tests, the U.S. lag in that area -- as certain politicians in Washington are now saying -- would be frozen. Let us recall that according to data from the Swedish Institute of Defense Research, the United States has tested one-third more nuclear devices than the Soviet Union since 1945, and together with the other Western states one and half times as many.

[Sobolev] Moreover, they have tested more in all environments -- in the air, under water, and on earth.

[Levin] That is absolutely correct -- and underground tests as well. And it is not out of place to recall that, up until today, the United States has carried out six explosions since the Soviet Union's introduction of the unilateral moratorium. Now they want to demonstratively carry out yet another explosion, directly connected with the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program. If this explosion takes place we shall be forced to resume nuclear tests. However, we do not want that. We want to see nuclear explosions brought to an end, the first specific step taken along the path of ending nuclear tests, and bilateral, trilateral, and multialteral talks begun. We are proposing a very broad program of action here.

[Agayants] Thus, Viktor Nikolayevich, we should stress once more that the foreign policy course of the CPSU and of our state is imbued with the most profound concern for preserving and consolidating peace on earth and has nothing to do with any kinds of short-term calculations or considerations, because in the nuclear era the security of one state cannot be built at the expense of others. This is extremely clear and well-argued and is set forth in both the 27th CPSU Congress documents and in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's latest speeches. It is a consistent, principled, and constructive course which also takes into account the interests of states belonging to different social systems, for we genuinely want an improvement in the international situation, an easing of tension, and the prevention of the threat of war.

[Levin] I would like to note yet another point regarding U.S. policy. Quoting spokesmen of the Washington administration, in the name of achieving President Reagan's principal objectives, which they name as the implementation of the SDI program -- the program of creating space strike weapons -- and the stepping up of assistance to, as they call them, anticommunist regimes around the globe -- we know that they mean: support for the Afghan bandits, support for the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] gangs in Angola; support for the Nicaraguan contras, etc. -- in the name of realizing these objectives, the administration is willing to risk, as THE WALL STREET JOURNAL wrote, a deterioration of relations with the Soviet Union. However, this is no risk. It is a calculated provocation aimed at forcing the Soviet Union to slam the door shut in order to bury the Geneva spirit under layers of militarism and adventurism. But we have frequently stated -- and it was said from the rostrum of the 27th party congress -- that we shall not fall for these provocations, we shall not slam the door shut. Responsibility for the destiny of peace and for security is too great.

[Sobolev] During Mozambican leader Samora Machel's visit to the Soviet Union, Comrade Gorbachev again emphasized that the Soviet Union will continue its persistent and painstaking work to implement its integral program for preventing a thermonuclear disaster and creating a safe world. And we know, the Soviet leader said, that the peoples of the world will be on our side in this noble cause. The past week has seen an upsurge in the antiwar movement throughout the world. So-called Easter marches were held. Demonstrators blocked U.S. and NATO bases in Western Europe, America, and Asia. Hundreds of thousands of people participated in such demonstrations in the FRG and the number of marchers around the world amounts to millions.

[Agayants] The antiwar movement has been injected with a powerful additional stimulus by, of course, the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives which have met with the support and approval of the broadest circles of the world public.

[Levin] On the subject of the present phase of the antiwar movement, I would like to draw listeners' attention to the fact that in the FRG the main slogan accompanying these Easter peace marches was the demand to refuse to support the Strategic Defense Initiative and the demand that the United States renounce its intention of implementing the star wars program.

[Sobolev] The United States has recently been making especially active efforts to develop this program and to assemble under the star wars banner, so to speak, a sort of universal army. U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger has gone to Japan where the main aim of his visit, according to correspondents accredited to the White House, is to, so to speak, put the final pressure on Tokyo, to force it to officially join in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Previous to that, the Pentagon chief signed an agreement in Washington with FRG Minister for Economics Bangemann giving the FRG Government's sanction to participation by West German firms in the program to create space strike weapons. The West German press asks what the FRG has gained from this, in particular the WESTFAELISCHE RUNDSCHAU which writes that there was no need at all for it, that the agreement was a political act, which supported Washington's policy and split, so to speak, the front of the West Europe countries. As the newspaper put it, after the fall of Bonn, it will be easier for Rome and other West Europe capitals to fall under the onslaught of the star wars program propagandizers.

[Levin] First, as we recall, was Great Britain, then the FRG -- and this has just been formulated in treaty form -- and Rome has already advocated participation in SDI.

[Sobolev] Although it has not signed an agreement.

[Levin] For the Americans the political aspect of the issue is important. And to claim that they do not understand this in Bonn! They understand perfectly and are thus consiciously assuming responsibility for the deterioration in the international situation. After all, one would think that in Europe any political issues should be tackled with particular delicacy since an extremely large amount of explosive materials are accumulated in Europe -- more than anywhere else -- and to remove the danger from these explosive materials is the main task. This was stated very clearly at the 27th party congress once again.

[Agayants] Washington is striving to drag its allies, including the Land of the Rising Sun, closer into its aggressive militaristic plans. Just today, Pentagon chief Weinberger, who is on a 2-week tour of countries in Asia and the Pacific Ocean region, persistently tried to convince his partners of the need to speed up the process of Japan's joining Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, at talks held during his stay in Japan. In Tokyo, they listened with satisfaction to these appeals. At the moment, let us recall, the third competent commission of representatives of Japan's largest and most influential corporations, comprising 55 people, is traveling the length and breadth of the United States. By 10 April, they have to submit their recommendations to the government on Japan's participation in SDI.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1329

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

12 MAY 86